

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated January 25, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on April 25, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

In the specification, the paragraphs 22, 26, 32 and 41 have been amended to correct minor editorial problems.

New claim 20 has been added to recite aspects of the invention. Claims 1, 10-11, 14-17 and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-20 will now remain pending following entry of this response. Applicants submit that the amendments and new claim do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12-15 and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al (US Patent No. 5,688,358) in view of Satoh et al (US PG PUB No. 2002/0162630). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 15 recite the use of dielectric material with a lower dielectric constant in the periphery of the support base than in a remaining portion of the substrate support base. As explained in the present application, the claimed use of materials with different dielectric materials in the support base allow for improved RF power coupling through the region of the support base inside of the intermediate support ridge. Tanaka et al and Satoh et al, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the claimed use of different dielectric materials, intentional or otherwise, in the support base.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1, 10 and 15, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are allowable, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 7, 11 and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al (US Patent No. 5,688,358) in view of Satoh et al. (US PGPub No. 2002/0162630) as applied to Claims 3, 6, 15 and further in view of and Martin (US patent No. 4, 676,193). Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al (US Patent No. 5,688,358) in view of Satoh et al (US PGPub No. 2002/0162630) as applied to Claim 1 and further in view of Uchino et al. (EP Pub. No. EP 1115140).

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as explained in the preceding paragraph in light of the amended claims 1, 10 and 15. Regarding claims 4, 7, 11 and 16, Tanaka et al., Satoh et al., and Martin, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the use of different dielectric materials, intentional or otherwise, in the support base as recited in claims 1, 10 and 15, from which these claims depend. Regarding claim 9, Tanaka et al., Satoh et al., and Uchino et al., alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the use of different dielectric materials, intentional or otherwise, in the support base as recited in claims 1, from which claim this depends.

Accordingly, claims 4, 7, 11, 16 and 9 are believed to be allowable and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show or suggest the invention as claimed.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants